

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030419US1

PATENT

SECTION II: REMARKS

It is respectfully requested that the changes as noted above in Section I be made to the present application.

In the Office Action mailed 2/25/2008, the earlier allowance of claim 8 was withdrawn in view of the "newly applied" Shea reference (U.S. Patent 7,056,265, herein referred to as "Shea"). However, it is noted that Shea had been cited and applied in the initial Office Action which was mailed 8/4/2006 and claim 8 was allowed in that Office Action over the then cited references which included both Shea and Millington. In response to the allowance of claim 8 in the initial Office Action, and in reliance upon, and agreement with the Examiner's direction that the substance of claim 8 is allowable if claim 8 were to be re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, applicant included the substance of claim 8 and all intervening claims into amended independent claim 1. The Examiner now rejects what the Examiner stated would be allowable and does not cite any new references upon which to base the withdrawal of the earlier allowance. Since the substance of original claim 8 was allowable over both Shea and Millington on 8/4/2006, the date of the First Office Action, the very same substance of original claim 8 must still be allowable over the very same Shea and Millington references on 2/25/2008, the date of the Second Office Action since nothing substantive has changed and no new references have been cited.

Reconsideration of the highly unusual 2/25/08 withdrawal of the earlier 8/4/06 allowance of claim 8, as currently represented in previously amended claim 1 as herein presented, is respectfully requested. Applicant reserves the right to appeal the propriety

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030419US1

PATENT

of the withdrawn allowance of claim 8 in the event the requested reconsideration is not granted or if the substance of original claim 8, as now included in claim 1, is not allowed.

Further in the above referenced Office Action mailed 2/25/2008, claims 1-2, 5-6 and 9-19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shea (U.S. Patent 7,056,265, herein referred to as "Shea"), and claims 3 and 7 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Shea in view of Millington (U.S. Patent 6,949,052, herein referred to as "Millington"). The above noted rejections are respectfully traversed. However, in order to further the prosecution of the present application, and without waiving any of applicant's rights to argue the allowability of the originally presented claims in a subsequent appeal or other proceeding in the event that the Examiner does not concur that the present amendment places the application in condition for allowance, applicant has herein amended the claims to include the indicated allowable subject matter, either directly or through dependence, in all of the amended claims as herein submitted, except claims 18 and 19, thereby placing all of those claims in condition for allowance. Claims 18 and 19 have herein been amended to include features and relationships not found in either Shea or Millington, or even a combination of Shea and Millington, and claims 18 and 19 are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

More specifically, in the First Office Action, it was indicated that claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Original claim 8 depended from original claim 4 which, in turn depended from original claim 1. Claim 4 included the ID signal feature and claim 8 included a second

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030419US1

PATENT

reading feature. Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form as amended claim 1 which now includes the above noted language of original claims 8 and 4. Claim 1 therefore, as previously amended, is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 4 and 8 have previously been cancelled in agreement with and reliance upon the Examiner's initial indication that those claims include allowable subject matter if re-written in independent form. Thus, the substance of original claims 4 and 8 have been previously cancelled and the substance of those claims has been included in amended independent claim 1.

Independent claim 17 has also been previously amended to include the above noted features of original claims 4 and 8 which have been indicated as being allowable subject matter. Therefore, claim 17 is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 6 have previously been amended to change their dependency from cancelled claim 4 to amended claim 1.

Claims 18 and 19 have herein been amended in order to further clarify several of the claimed features of one embodiment of the present application. Neither Shea nor Millington discloses or suggests the total integrated system, including the components and relationships between and among the recited components, as presently set forth in currently amended claims 18 and 19, and therefore it is believed that currently amended claims 18 and 19 are allowable under USC 103(a) over Shea.

All of the remaining dependent claims ultimately depend from, and include all of the limitations of one of the amended independent claims 1 or 18, in addition to the further

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030419US1

PATENT

limitations of the individual dependent claims themselves. Therefore dependent claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-16 and 19 are also believed to be allowable, under 35 USC 103(a) over Shea and Millington, taken individually or in combination.

It should be noted that applicant is claiming only that the **total combination** of elements **and relationships** as recited in the claims as herein amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Applicant is aware the individual elements of any claim can be isolated, and, when standing alone, those elements can be found in existing references. The similarity of various pieces and parts of the references as noted on pages 2-5 of the above-identified Office Action have been noted but it is believed that there is **no** suggestion or nexus among the references to even suggest any combination of those references or the total combination of elements and relationships as recited in the claims as herein amended. Where there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references for the **specific total combination** of elements **and relationships** among those elements, as claimed by an applicant, it is submitted to be inappropriate to search the prior art using applicant's own disclosure as a recipe, to find piecemeal elements in prior art references for individual claimed elements, and then to combine those references in a manner not contemplated by the prior art but disclosed only by the applicant in order to reject applicant's own claims.

Therefore, as herein presented, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-19 are believed to be in condition for allowance, an early notice of which is hereby requested. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions in order to expedite the allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920030419US1

PATENT

contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below, prior to the issuance of another Office Action, in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to further amend the application by Supplemental Amendment or Examiner's Amendment, as may be appropriate, to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner's attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert V. Wilder/

Robert V. Wilder (Tel: 512-246-8555)
Registration No. 26,352
Attorney for Applicants
4235 Kingsburg Drive
Round Rock, Texas 78681